

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 and 10 pending. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 are amended.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended, and it is submitted that the amendment obviates this rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ford Taurus and Mercury Sable Haynes Repair Manual in view of Takayama (USP 6,119,060), Maue (USP 5,785,532), and further in view of Toshihiro (JP 64-30856). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 10 recite that the engine control computer, the relay block, the junction box, and the meter unit are located at a substantially same height in a vehicle height direction. The applied references do not disclose or suggest at least that the engine control computer, the relay block, the junction box, and the meter unit are located at a substantially same height in a vehicle height direction.

The Office Action admits this feature is not shown in Taurus, but asserts that this feature is shown in Takayama, and refers to Figs. 1 and 2, col. 3 lines 30-34, and col. 9, lines 17-25. However, Takayama does not show the engine control computer, the relay block, the junction box, and the meter unit are located at a substantially same height in a vehicle height direction as required by claims 1 and 10. In fact, Takayama teaches away from a same height configuration. Takayama specifically illustrates units U1-U3 stacked one on top of another (See Fig. 2). Contrast the stacked configuration of Takayama with the same height configuration of the claimed invention, as illustrated in Fig. 3, for example. Furthermore, Takayama requires elements U1-U3 to be stacked at different heights so that they can be mounted to align with the openings and switch

groups 56-58 of display 55. Takayama has no teaching or suggestion of locating these elements at a substantially same height in a vehicle height direction as required by claims 1 and 10.

Furthermore, claims 1 and 10 recite the engine control computer, the relay block, the junction box, and the meter unit are sequentially aligned substantially along the longitudinal centerline. This feature is not disclosed or suggested by any of the references, and as such, claims 1 and 10, as well as all claims dependent therefrom, would not have been obvious over the applied references.

It is further noted that the applied references do not disclose or suggest aligning such elements at a substantially same height and substantially along a centerline and as by the claims of the application.

Accordingly, the applied references do not render obvious claims 1 or 10, or any claims dependent therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is requested.


For at least the above reasons, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt consideration and allowance are solicited.

The Office is authorized to charge any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Should there be any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants'  
undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Nov. 4, 2004

  
for David J. Zibelli  
(Reg. No. 36,394) REG. NO. 43,572

KENYON & KENYON  
1500 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1257  
Telephone: (202) 220-4200  
Facsimile: (202) 220-4201